arXiv:hep-th/9903037v1 3 Mar 1999

On the supersymmetric formulation of Unitary Matrix Model of type IIB

Tsukasa Tada[a] and Asato Tsuchiya[b]

[a] *KEK Theory Group*
1-1 Oho, Tsukuba
Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan
tada@ccthmail.kek.jp

[b] *Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science*
Osaka University
Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan
tsuchiya@funpth.phys.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

(February, 1999)

We propose a unitary matrix formulation of type IIB matrix model. One-loop effective action of the model exhibits supersymmetry for BPS background in the large N limit.

One of the most promising approaches towards a nonperturbative formulation of string theory is the matrix model [1–7]. For example, the action of the IIB matrix model [1,2] is nothing but a reduction [8] of $N=1$ ten-dimensional Super Yang Mills theory:

$$S_{\text{IKKT}} = -\frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Tr}([A_\mu, A_\nu]^2) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu[A_\mu,\psi]. \qquad (1)$$

While those matrix models, either so-called Matrix theory in IIA language or the IIB matrix model (also known as the IKKT model) , are composed of hermite matrices, there are several regions where models in terms of unitary matrices would be preferable.

For example, to treat one of the space-time dimensions with periodic boundary condition, one would have to introduce infinite copies of the original matrices and end up with introducing a corresponding gauge field [9]. Studies along this line have been revealing many interesting features of matrix models [10], especially the relation with D-branes [11]. In those studies, the compactification procedure is needed to utilize the T-dual argument. [1] It would be useful if one could have a matrix model in terms of unitary matrices,

$$U_\mu = e^{iA_\mu}, \qquad (2)$$

in the first place, since U_μ apparently represents compactified space (or time). We, then, acquire a coupling constant in the theory, just as the emergence of the gauge coupling constant in the hermite model upon conventional compactification. Therefore, for example, it would be interesting to compare the result from the hermite case [12–14] with the unitary case in the numerical study.

There is another advantage of using a unitary matrix. In matrix models, pairs of matrices which satisfy Heisenberg algebra,

$$[p,q] = \frac{2\pi i}{N}, \qquad (3)$$

are used to construct BPS states. There is no way to represent the above algebra in terms of finite $N \times N$ hermite matrices. On the other hand, in terms of unitary matrices,

$$U = e^{ip}, \quad V = e^{iq}, \qquad (4)$$

there is a well known representation in terms of finite unitary matrices, namely the shift and clock matrices:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (5)$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i/N} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{4\pi i/N} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (6)$$

Therefore, we would have an explicit representation of BPS states in unitary matrix models regularized with finite N. Also, one can speculate that the relation between matrix models and noncommutative geometry [15] can be more transparent in this manner.

Despite all of those advantages that we can anticipate, there is an obstruction in building unitary analogue of Matrix theory or the IIB matrix model.

---

[1] In [12], the compactification of matrix models is considered from a different view of point, that is, rather to explain the real dimensionality of the world.

A naive attempt to rewrite Matrix theory or the IIB matrix model in unitary matrices,

$$S = -\sum \mathrm{Tr}(U_\mu U_\nu U_\mu^\dagger U_\nu^\dagger) + \frac{i}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu(U_\mu \psi U_\mu^\dagger - U_\mu^\dagger \psi U_\mu), \tag{7}$$

immediately encounters a difficulty [16,17]. In [16] the unitary version of Matrix theory is considered, and it turnes out that the model does not possess supersymmetry. This situation is the same for the IIB case. The action of the IKKT model (1) has enhanced N=2 supersymmetry:

$$\begin{cases} \delta^{(1)}\psi = \frac{i}{2}[A_\mu, A_\nu]\Gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon \\ \delta^{(1)}A_\mu = i\bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_\mu \psi, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{cases} \delta^{(2)}\psi = \xi \\ \delta^{(2)}A_\mu = 0. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

However, a naive generalization of the above algebra to the unitary case,

$$\begin{cases} \delta^{(1)}\psi = \frac{i}{2}(U_\mu U_\nu U_\mu^\dagger U_\nu^\dagger - h.c.)\Gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon \\ \delta^{(1)}U_\mu = i\bar{\epsilon}\Gamma_\mu(U_\mu\psi + \psi U_\mu) \end{cases}, \begin{cases} \delta^{(2)}\psi = \xi \\ \delta^{(2)}U_\mu = 0, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

does not form the susy algebra. Since this N=2 supersymmetry in 10 dimensions is supposed to play an essential role to relate those models with gravity, the naive unitary models are apparently unsatisfactory.

As a matter of fact, the lack of supersymmetry in the above naive unitary models is somewhat obvious from the beginning. When one regards the IKKT model as the reduction of N=1 10d Super Yang Mills theory in the manner of Eguchi-Kawai [8] to zero dimension, they can be seen as a model on a lattice with just one site. The action written in terms of unitary matrices is simply the usual plaquett action. Now, fermionic degrees of freedom doubles in number when fermions are put on a lattice. Those so-called doublers break the equality in the number of degrees of freedom between bosons and fermions; thus there is no supersymmetry.

In [17], it was attempted to resolve this difficulty by employing the overlap formalism, which has been used in a higher dimensional lattice model. The overlap formalism enables one to eliminate the unwanted doubler degree of freedom of the fermions. While this procedure cuts the degree of freedom of fermions by half, the supersymmetry is still not manifest in this formalism.

In this note we propose another formulation of a unitary matrix model of type IIB. To accommodate supersymmetry we simply double the degrees of freedom of the bosons instead of halving those of the fermions. [2] Then, the one-loop effective action vanishes for BPS background in our unitary model.

First, let us calculate the one-loop effective action for the naive unitary matrix model (7) for BPS background. We will see that the result, itself, suggests the modification which we propose here. The following calculation is almost simple generalization of that of [1] to a unitary case.

The general classical configuration U_μ^0 for unitary matrices is characterized by the existence of a certain set of unitary matrices $e^{if^0_{\mu\nu}}$, which satisfy the following relations with U_μ^0:

$$U_\mu^0 U_\nu^0 = U_\nu^0 U_\mu^0 e^{if^0_{\mu\nu}}, \tag{11}$$

$$[U_\mu^0, e^{if^0_{\mu\nu}}] = 0. \tag{12}$$

The above relations correspond to the following equations of motion of hermite matrix model:

$$[A_\mu^0, A_\nu^0] = -if^0_{\mu\nu}, \tag{13}$$

$$[f_{\mu\nu}, A_\mu^0] = 0. \tag{14}$$

We now put

$$U_\mu = U_\mu^0 e^{iX_\mu} \tag{15}$$

and integrate over X_μ up to quadratic order. Expanding the bosonic part of the action,

$$U_\mu U_\nu U_\mu^\dagger U_\nu^\dagger, \tag{16}$$

in terms of X_μ up to quadratic order yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mu\neq\nu} tr e^{if^0_{\mu\nu}} \\ &+\sum_{\mu,\nu} tr(X_\mu U_\nu^0 X_\mu U_\nu^{0\dagger} - X_\mu^2 + U_\mu^0 X_\nu U_\mu^{0\dagger} X_\nu - X_\nu^2) e^{if^0_{\mu\nu}} \\ &+tr\left(\sum_\mu \left(U_\mu^0 X_\mu U_\mu^{0\dagger} - X_\mu\right)\right)^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

While the first term in (17) simply gives an irrelevant constant after X_μ integration, the third term in (17) suggests the following natural gauge fixing term:

$$F = \sum_\mu (U_\mu^0 X_\mu U_\mu^{0\dagger} - X_\mu). \tag{18}$$

The BRS invariant action can be obtained by adding a gauge fixing term and a ghost term, as follows:

---

[2] We owe this idea to H. Kawai.

$$S = \quad -\sum \mathrm{Tr}(U_\mu U_\nu U_\mu^\dagger U_\nu^\dagger) + \mathrm{Tr}F^2 \\ + \tfrac{i}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu(U_\mu \psi U_\mu^\dagger - U_\mu^\dagger \psi U_\mu) + b\delta_{BRS}F. \tag{19}$$

The BRS transformation for unitary matrices is

$$\delta_{BRS}U_\mu = e^{-ic}U_\mu e^{ic} - U_\mu = -i[c, U_\mu], \tag{20}$$

and for X_μ it is

$$\delta_{BRS}X_\mu = U_\mu^\dagger c U_\mu + c. \tag{21}$$

In the following we evaluate each quadratic integration for the BPS background, that is, for the case that $f^0_{\mu\nu}$ is a *c-number*. It is useful to introduce a basis of $N \times N$ hermite matrices T^a which satisfies $trT^aT^b = \delta_{ab}$. In terms of this basis X_μ can be written as

$$X_\mu = \sum T^a x^a_\mu. \tag{22}$$

Also, we define the following matrix:

$$(u^0_\mu)_{ab} \equiv \mathrm{Tr}T^a U^0_\mu T^b U^{0\dagger}_\mu. \tag{23}$$

It is easy to see that u^0_μ is a $N^2 \times N^2$ unitary matrix. Note that u^0_μ commutes each other,

$$u^0_\mu u^0_\nu = u^0_\nu u^0_\mu, \tag{24}$$

if U^0_μ corresponds to the BPS background.

First, (17), the quadratic part of $-\sum \mathrm{Tr}(U_\mu U_\nu U_\mu^\dagger U_\nu^\dagger) + \mathrm{Tr}F^2$ becomes

$$\sum_{\mu,\nu} tr(X_\mu U^0_\nu X_\mu U^{0\dagger}_\nu - X^2_\mu + U^0_\mu X_\nu U^{0\dagger}_\mu X_\nu - X^2_\nu)\cos f^0_{\mu\nu}, \tag{25}$$

provided that $f^0_{\mu\nu}$ is a *c-number*. This can be written in terms of the notation introduced above,

$$-\sum_{\mu,\nu} \cos f^0_{\mu\nu}\left({}^t x_\mu u^0_\nu x_\mu + {}^t x_\mu u^{0\dagger}_\nu x_\mu - 2\,{}^t x_\mu x_\mu\right). \tag{26}$$

The integration over x_μ is evaluated as

$$\prod_\mu \sqrt{\det \sum_\nu \left[\left(2 - u^0_\nu - u^{0\dagger}_\nu\right)\cos f^0_{\mu\nu}\right]}. \tag{27}$$

Secondly, the quadratic part of the ghost term,

$$b\sum_\mu (U^0_\mu c U^{0\dagger}_\mu + U^{0\dagger}_\mu c U^0_\mu - 2c), \tag{28}$$

can be evaluated in a similar manner, and leads to

$$\det \sum_\nu \left(2 - u^0_\nu - u^{0\dagger}_\nu\right). \tag{29}$$

Finally, expanding the fermion matrices with the same basis,

$$\psi = \sum T^a \psi_a, \tag{30}$$

gives the following expression for the fermionic term in the action:

$$\frac{i}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar{\psi}\Gamma^\mu(U_\mu\psi U_\mu^\dagger - U_\mu^\dagger\psi U_\mu) = \frac{i}{2}\psi_a^\dagger \sum_\mu \Gamma^0(\Gamma^\mu u_\mu - \Gamma^\mu u_\mu^\dagger)\psi_a. \tag{31}$$

The integration over ten-dimensional Majorana-Weyl fermions yields

$$\det\left(\frac{i}{2}\sum_\mu \Gamma^0\Gamma^\mu\left(u_\mu - u_\mu^\dagger\right)\right)^8. \tag{32}$$

It is rather convenient to rewrite the above while noting that

$$\det\left(\frac{i}{2}\sum_\mu \Gamma^0\Gamma^\mu\left(u_\mu - u_\mu^\dagger\right)\right) = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{i}{2}\sum_\mu \Gamma^0\Gamma^\mu(u_\mu - u_\mu^\dagger)\right)^2}. \tag{33}$$

With a simple gamma matrix algebra and (24) one finds

$$\det\left(\frac{i}{2}\sum_\mu \Gamma^0\Gamma^\mu\left(u_\mu - u_\mu^\dagger\right)\right) = \sqrt{\det\left[-\frac{1}{4}\left(u^0_\lambda - u^{0\dagger}_\lambda\right)^2\right]}. \tag{34}$$

Collecting all of the above result, we obtain the following one-loop partition function for general BPS background:

$$\prod_\mu\left(\det\sum_\nu\left[(2 - u^0_\nu - u^{0\dagger}_\nu)\cos f^0_{\mu\nu}\right]\right)^{-1/2} \\ \times\left(\det\sum_\nu\left(2 - u^0_\nu - u^{0\dagger}_\nu\right)\right)\left(\det\left[-\frac{1}{4}\left(u^0_\lambda - u^{0\dagger}_\lambda\right)^2\right]\right)^4. \tag{35}$$

The above quantity is supposed to become a constant if it is the effective partition function for supersymmetric background. Since we do not have supersymmetric algebra for this model, it is rather the expected result. However, the above result has a very suggestive form to obtain a supersymmetric model.

First, obstruction to supersymmetry in (35) is $\cos f^0_{\mu\nu}$ term in the bosonic contribution. Without it, the bosonic contribution would have the same form as the ghost contribution. To avoid that difficulty, we perform the following analysis in $1/N$ expansion. We postulate that the magnitude of $f^0_{\mu\nu}$ for the BPS state is

$$f^0_{\mu\nu} \sim O(\frac{1}{N}). \tag{36}$$

Eqs. (5) and (6) provide an example of non-commuting pair of unitary matrices that satisfy (36), which may seem to lead commuting pair of matrices in the large N limit at first sight. Then, in the $1/N$ expansion

$$\cos f^0_{\mu\nu} = 1 + O(\frac{1}{N^2}) \qquad (37)$$

for the general BPS background. Note that for the background of diagonal matrices, that is, for the $f^0_{\mu\nu} = 0$ case, $\cos f^0_{\mu\nu} = 1$ without the subleading contribution of $1/N$. Also, we expect the contribution of $O(1/N)$ from the integration over fermion zero modes. Therefore, the one-loop partition function up to the leading order of $1/N$ is

$$\left\{ \det \sum_\nu \left(2 - u^0_\nu - u^{0\dagger}_\nu\right) \right\}^{(-5+1)} \left(\det \left[-\frac{1}{4} \left(u^0_\lambda - u^{0\dagger}_\lambda \right)^2 \right] \right)^4 . \qquad (38)$$

One can now see that the above expression would become a constant by cancelling each factor from the denominator and numerator if u^0_ν were replaced by $(u^0_\nu)^2$. In fact, this is possible by replacing U_μ with U_μ^2 in the bosonic action and gauge fixing term, as follows:

$$\sum \mathrm{Tr}(U_\mu^2 U_\nu^2 (U_\mu^\dagger)^2 (U_\nu^\dagger)^2), \qquad (39)$$

$$F = \sum_\mu ((U^0_\mu)^2 X_\mu (U^{0\dagger}_\mu)^2 - X_\mu). \qquad (40)$$

We then expand U_μ as

$$U_\mu U_\mu = U^0_\mu U^0_\mu e^{iX_\mu}, \qquad (41)$$

where the summation over μ is not taken. This procedure corresponds to integration with the measure $\mathcal{D}(U_\mu)^2$. Then, the contribution from the bosonic part of the action and the gauge fixing term yield in the leading $1/N$ expansion

$${}^t x_\mu \left(u_\nu^2 + (u_\nu^\dagger)^2 - 2\right) x_\mu + O(\frac{1}{N}), \qquad (42)$$

while ghost part contributes as

$$\mathrm{Tr} b (\sum_\mu (U^0_\mu)^2 c (U^{0\dagger}_\mu)^2 + (U^{0\dagger}_\mu)^2 c (U^0_\mu)^2 - 2c). \qquad (43)$$

The above two give the contribution to the partition function,

$$\left\{ \det \sum_\nu \left(2 - \left(u^0_\nu\right)^2 - \left(u^{0\dagger}_\nu\right)^2 \right) \right\}^{(-4)}, \qquad (44)$$

which cancels with the fermionic contribution in (38) up to an irrelevant numerical factor of $\frac{1}{4}$. Here, we have used the completeness of the Hermite basis, $(u^2)_{ac} = u_{ab}u_{bc} = \mathrm{Tr} T^a U^2 T^c (U^\dagger)^2$. Taking care of the numerical factor $\frac{1}{4}$ by normalizing the fermionic part, we obtain a unitary matrix model, which exhibits supersymmetry at the one-loop level in the large N limit:

$$\int \mathcal{D}(U_\mu)^2 \mathcal{D}\psi \exp[\sum \mathrm{Tr}(U_\mu^2 U_\nu^2 (U_\mu^\dagger)^2 (U_\nu^\dagger)^2) - i \sum \mathrm{Tr} \bar{\psi} \Gamma^\mu (U_\mu \psi U_\mu^\dagger - U_\mu^\dagger \psi U_\mu)]. \qquad (45)$$

The above expression (45) summarizes the main result of the present paper. A few remarks are in order: First, the above expression vanishes for the BPS states only in the large N limit. For example, consider the case $f^0_{\mu\nu} = 0$; namely, the case that U^0_μ commutes with each other. In that case that there exist N fermion zero modes to be integrated out, which produce non-trivial interactions between the eigenvalues of the matrices in the hermite case [12,18]. Since total number of integration is N^2, the contribution from those zero modes yields $O(1/N)$, nonvanishing subleading term. The analysis of fermion zero modes for more general backgrounds involves some technical issues so we left it for future study. Second, we were unable to find a supersymmetric transformation of the classical action of (45). Therefore, the supersymmetry shown here seems to be only at the one-loop level. It would be interesting to see whether supersymmetry persists at the two-loop order. Also, the calculation for a more general background like the block diagonal background is rather straightforward. Third, there will be other mappings from hermite matrices to unitary ones than that in (2). For example, $(I + iA_\mu/2)(I - iA_\mu/2)^{-1}$ also leads to a unitary matrix. In this case, however, the relation between the hermite model and the unitary one becomes more complicated. Lastly, we seem to need the postulation (36) to obtain the supersymmetric states, that is, BPS state. Since the postulation (36) is related with the scaling which we are taking, the better understanding of the physical meaning of the above postulation would be desired.

In summary we have proposed a new formulation of the IIB matrix model in terms of unitary matrices, (45). The model has a vanishing one-loop effective action for the BPS states in the large N limit. We hope that we can shed more light on the issues addressed above in future publications.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank H. Kawai for the collaboration at the early stage of the project and for illuminating discussions. We have also greatly benefitted from countless discussions with H. Aoki, N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Itoyama, Y. Kitazawa, T. Suyama and colleagues in the KEK theory group.

[1] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and A. Tsuchiya, *A Large-N Reduced Model as Superstring*, Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997) 467, hep-th/9612115.

[2] M. Fukuma, H. Kawai. Y. Kitazawa and A. Tsuchiya, *String Field Theory from IIB Matrix Model*, Nucl. Phys. **B510** (1998) 158. hep-th/9705128.

[3] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S.H. Shenker and L. Susskind, *M Theory as a Matrix Model: a Conjecture*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112, hep-th/9610043.

[4] V. Periwal, *Matrices on a Point as the Theory of Everything*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 1711, hep-th/9611103.

[5] T. Yoneya, *Schild Action and Space-Time Uncertainty Principle in String Theory*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **97** (1997) 949, hep-th/9703078.

[6] R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde *Matrix String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B500** (1997) 43, hep-th/9703030.

[7] H. Itoyama and A. Tokura, *USp(2k) Matrix Model: F theory Connection*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99** (1998) 129, hep-th/9708123; *USp(2k) Matrix Model: Nonperturbative Approach to Orientifolds*, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 026002, hep-th/9801084.

[8] T. Eguchi and H. Kawai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1063;
G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. **112B** (1982) 463;
D. Gross and Y. Kitazawa, Nucl. Phys. **B206** (1982) 440;
G. Bhanot, U. Heller and H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **113B** (1982) 47;
S. Das and S. Wadia, Phys. Lett. **117B** (1982) 228;
J. Alfaro and B. Sakita, Phys. Lett. **121B** (1983) 339.

[9] W. Taylor, *D-brane Field Theory and Compact Spaces*, Phys. Lett. **B394** (1997) 283, hep-th/9611042.

[10] See for example, W. Taylor, *"Lectures on D-branes, Gauge Theory and M(atrices)"*, hep-th/9801182, and references therein.

[11] Y. Kitazawa and H. Takata, *"D-brane Scattering in IIB String Theory and IIB Matrix Model"*, hep-th/9810004.

[12] H. Aoki, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, *Space-Time Structures from IIB Matrix Model*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99** (1998) 713, hep-th/9802085.

[13] T. Hotta, J. Nishimura and A. Tsuchiya, *Dynamical Aspects of Large N Reduced Models*, hep-th/9811220, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.

[14] W. Krauth and M. Staudacher, *Eigenvalue Distributions in Yang-Mills Integrals*, hep-th/9902113.

[15] A. Connes, *Gravity coupled with matter and the formulation of non commutative geometry*, Comm. Math. Phys. **182** (1996) 155, hep-th/9603053;
A. Connes, M. Douglas and A. Schwarz, *Noncommutative Geometry and Matrix Theory: Compactification on Tori*, JHEP **9802 : 003** (1998), hep-th/9711162;
M. R. Douglas and C. Hull, *" D-branes and the Noncommutative Torus"*, JHEP **9802 : 008** (1998), hep-th/9711165.

[16] A. P. Polychronakos, *Unitary Matrix Model for Toroidal Compactifications of M Theory*, Phys. Lett. **B403** (1997) 239, hep-th/9703073.

[17] N. Kitsunezaki and J. Nishimura, *Unitary IIB Matrix Model and the Dynamical Generation of the Space Time*, Nucl. Phys. **B526** (1998) 351, hep-th/9707162.

[18] M. B. Green and M. Gutperle, *"Effects of D-instantons"*, Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997) 195, hep-th/9701093.